

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

The specification has been amended to correct a typographical spelling error. Claims 10, 26, 36, 50 and 64 have been amended to correct some inadvertent and typographical errors. Claims 48 and 49 have been amended to delete the reference to a "method" and to make them dependent from Claim 47. There has been no change in substance and no new matter is involved.

The rejection of Claims 34 and 45 as being unpatentable over Kumada (U.S. 6,337,922 B2) in view of Kipphan et al. (U.S. 4,955,290), under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), is respectfully traversed. Claims 34 and 45 have been amended to restrict the control image to one comprising at least four spaced apart colors. The present specification on page 9, beginning at line 12, describes the control image as comprising a sequence of any predetermined N colors, especially those that are well spaced apart (easily distinguishable). Beginning on page 10, at line 2, N=4, so no new matter is being added. An example of four spaced apart colors would be red, yellow, blue and purple. Kipphan et al. neither show nor suggest any number of colors being used to encode additional information beyond bare or full tone, nor the specific number of four colors that can encode 24 values using 4 colors in a sequence of 4 positions.

The Examiner indicates that Kumada does not disclose a control image or wherein a corresponding control image is used to identify the print job of the printer image. The Examiner further states that the identification field 28 of Kipphan et al. (column 9, lines 9-26, in the description of the preferred embodiments) reads on the corresponding control image of the present invention. Kipphan et al. state that the identification fields are easily recognized "since the field is either full-tone or no-tone (e.g. black or white tone)" (column 10, lines 11-12). Kipphan et al. state in the summary of the invention that "a further feature of the [Kipphan et al.] invention is to provide a system wherein the correct assignment of a measured printed product to the respective printing machine is always maintained, and preferably such that the recognition of the correct assignment is effected automatically" (column 3, lines 27-32), and that "there is provided means for automatically recognizing the correctness of the assignment between a respective printing machine and a respective printed product measured by the central ink density measuring installation which include the use of an identification field on each printed product that, by its location, is correlated with data contained in a data carrier, for confirming or rejecting the correctness of the assignment" (column 3, lines 55-61), and also that the "identification method includes the use of an identifying measuring field, which is, briefly stated, a selected one of a

plurality of fields on a test stripe having a plurality of fields, that is left either completely bare ('no-tone') or completely full-tone thereby marking them as being identification fields. The particular field on each print, that is left bare or full-tone designates by its position the particular machine chosen for the printing of the job. For example, if there are n printing machines in the printing establishment, there will typically be at least n differently positioned identifying fields in the test stripe, each one identifying one particular machine" (column 5, lines 25-37). Since neither Kumada nor Kipphan et al. shows or suggests a remote printing system wherein the control image comprises at least four spaced apart colors that is used to identify a print job of the printed image, as now recited in Claims 34 and 45, it is respectfully submitted that the invention now defined in Claims 34 and 45 is not obvious over Kumada in view of Kipphan et al., and that Claims 34 and 45 are patentable over the combination of these two references.

Claims 35 through 38 and Claims 46 through 50 are dependent from Claims 34 and 45, respectively. Therefore, Claims 35 through 38 and Claims 46 through 50 incorporate the patentable novelty of Claims 34 and 45, respectively, and the allowance of Claims 35 through 38 and Claims 46 through 50 over Kumada in view of Kipphan et al. appears to be in order for at least the reasons given with respect to Claims 34 and 45.

New Claim 65 recites a system for remote printing wherein the image server computer is configured to perform the initial transmitting and receiving steps repeatedly. The utility of performing the steps repeatedly is disclosed in the present specification on page 11, at lines 9 through 11, where it is described that the printer's characteristic function may be continually updated using information from one or more print jobs. Kipphan et al. do not show or suggest the utility of performing these steps repeatedly. In fact, the teaching of Kipphan et al. is clearly to assign a single identification field to all print jobs originating from a single printer, thereby making it impossible to continually update the printer's characteristic function because it would be impossible to know which print job is the most recent. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 65 is patentable over Kumada in view of Kipphan et al.

Claims 66 through 68 are dependent from Claim 65. Therefore, Claims 66 through 68 incorporate the patentable novelty of Claim 65, and the allowance of Claims 66 through 68 over the cited references appears to be in order for at least the reasons given above for Claim 65.

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Thomas H. Magee". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

THOMAS H. MAGEE
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT
Registration No.: 27,355
Telephone: (302) 892-0795
Facsimile: (302) 892-7949

Dated: April 8, 2004